

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-26 are pending. By this Amendment, the title, Abstract, drawings, and claims 1-10, 12-18, and 20 are amended, and new claims 21-26 are added. No new matter is added. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims, and the drawings. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objected to the title as allegedly being not descriptive. Accordingly, the title has been amended to be more descriptive. Accordingly, the objection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action objected to the drawings, indicating that Figures 1 and 2 should include a legend such as "Prior Art" or "Related Art". Figures 1 and 2 have been amended to include the legend "Related Art" consistent with the specification. Accordingly, the objection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claim 1 has been amended to address the Examiner's comments. Accordingly, the objection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Larsen et al. (hereinafter "Larsen"), U.S. Patent No. 4,332,992. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, a convection assembly mounted at a side of the inner case that transmits heat to the cooling chamber, wherein the convection assembly comprises a convection heater configured to generate heat for convention heating, and a convention fan configured to transmit the heat generated by the heater to the cooling chamber, and wherein the convention heater is positioned adjacent the convention fan. Larsen does not disclose or suggest such features, or the claimed combination of independent claim 1.

That is, Larsen discloses an air flow system for a combination microwave and convection oven. The oven includes an oven cavity 12, an electric resistance heater 17, a magnetron 18, a dual-end blower 19, and a control panel 20 surrounded by a cabinet 14. See Fig. 1, and column 3, lines 64-68 of Larson. As shown in Figure 1 of Larsen, the electrical resistance heater 17 is disposed adjacent a top wall of the oven cavity 12, and the blower 19 is disposed at a side of the oven cavity 12. The electrical resistance heater 17 is not positioned adjacent the blower 19.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claim 1 over Larsen should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 2 and 6, as well as added claims 21-26, are allowable over Larsen at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

Serial No. **10/575,860**

Docket No. **K-0800**

Amdt. dated December 11, 2007

Reply to Office Action of September 26, 2007

The Office Action rejected claims 2-4 and 7-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Larsen in view of Takeshita Japanese Patent No. JP 5-144561. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claims 2-4 and 7-20 are allowable over Larsen at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for their added features. Takeshita fails to overcome the deficiencies of Larsen, as it is merely cited for allegedly teaching the location of the cooling fan. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 2-4 and 7-20 over Larsen and Takeshita should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Larsen in view of Takeshita and further in view of Idomoto, Japanese Patent No. 2-244586. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claim 5 is allowable over Larsen and Takeshita at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1, 2, and 4, from which it depends, as well as for its added features. Idomoto fails to overcome the deficiencies of Larsen and Takeshita, as it is merely cited for allegedly teaching a tilted cooling fan. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 5 over Larsen, Takeshita, and Idomoto should be withdrawn.

Serial No. **10/575,860**

Docket No. **K-0800**

Amdt. dated December 11, 2007

Reply to Office Action of September 26, 2007

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP

  
Carol L. Druzbeck  
Registration No. 40,287

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3777 CLD:tlg

**Date: December 11, 2007**

\\Fk4\Documents\2016\2016-996\136111.doc

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**